

## <u>CERTIFIED MAIL</u> RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

AUG 2 0 2007

John G. Mundinger Consulting for Creative Solutions, LLC 1414 Hauser Boulevard Helena, MT 59601

RE: MUR 5860

Friends of Conrad Burns - 2006 and

James Swain, in his official

capacity as treasurer

Dear Mr. Mundinger:

On August 13, 2007, the Federal Election Commission reviewed the allegations in your complaint dated October 17, 2006, and found that on the basis of the information provided in your complaint, and information provided by the Respondents, there is no reason to believe Friends of Conrad Burns – 2006 and James Swain, in his official capacity as treasurer, violated 2 U.S.C. § 441d. Accordingly, on August 13, 2007, the Commission closed the file in this matter.

Documents related to the case will be placed on the public record within 30 days. *See* Statement of Policy Regarding Disclosure of Closed Enforcement and Related Files, 68 Fed. Reg. 70,426 (Dec. 18, 2003). The Factual and Legal Analysis, which more fully explains the Commission's finding is enclosed.

The Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended, allows a complainant to seek judicial review of the Commission's dismissal of this action. See 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(8).

Sincerely,

Susan L. Lebeaux

**Assistant General Counsel** 

Sun L. Zeleaux

Enclosure
Factual and Legal Analysis

1	FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
2	FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS
3 4 5	RESPONDENTS: Friends of Conrad Burns-2006 MUR 5860 and James Swain, in his official capacity as treasurer
6	I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>
7	This matter arises from a complaint alleging that an automated recorded telephone
8	call did not include a disclaimer as required by the Federal Election Campaign Act of
9	1971, as amended ("the Act"). Specifically, the complainant alleges that on
10	September 29, 2006, he received a 60-second recorded call, the content of which led him to
11	assume it was made by the campaign of Senator Conrad Burns, or "some other group
12	working on behalf of his reelection," but which "included no disclaimer information."
13	Complaint at 1. Respondent Friends of Conrad Burns-2006 denies any involvement with
14	the alleged call. See Response of Friends of Conrad Burns-2006 ("Response"). As
15	discussed more fully below; the Commission found no reason to believe that Friends of
16	Conrad Burns-2006 and James Swain, in his official capacity as treasurer, violated
17	2 U.S.C. §441d.
18	II. <u>FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS</u>
19	A. Factual Summary
20	The complainant, a Montana resident, alleges that on September 26, 2006, he
21	received the following 60-second automated recorded telephone call/survey (the
22	transcription of which he noted is "approximate"):
23 24	"Do you intend to vote in the 2006 election? Do you intend to vote for Sen. Conrad Burns? Do you intend to vote for Jon Tester? Do you think parents should have the

MUR 5860
Factual and Legal Analysis
Friends of Conrad Burns-2006 and
James Swain, in his official capacity as treasurer

right to choose their child's school? Do you think marriage should be defined as 1 2 between one man and one woman? If you knew the following information about 3 Jon Tester – the information implied that Jon Tester would raise taxes, including 4 references to Tester's record that have appeared in Sen. Burns' commercials - and that Sen. Burns has never voted to increase taxes, would that change your opinion 5 6 about Sen. Burns?" 7 Complaint at 1. The complaint does not make a specific allegation as to what person or entity was responsible for the call, purportedly because "the recording included no 8 9 disclaimer information." Id. See note 1, infra. However, the complainant alleges that 10 based on the content of the call, "it is clear that the call was made either by Sen. Burns' 11 campaign or by some other group working on behalf of his reelection." Id. 12 B. Analysis 13 Any public communication paid for by a political committee must include a 14 disclaimer identifying who paid for and authorized such communication. 15 2 U.S.C. §441d(a); 11 C.F.R. §110.11(a). The term "public communication" includes a 16 communication by means of a "telephone bank" to the general public. 17 2 U.S.C. §431(22). A "telephone bank" means more than 500 telephone calls of an 18 identical or substantially similar nature made within any 30-day period. 19 2 U.S.C. §431(24). In this instance, it is unknown whether the call allegedly received by 20 the complainant was one of 500 identical or substantially similar calls made within a 30-21 day period, and therefore whether the call was in fact a public communication. 22 The complaint asserts that Senator Conrad Burns' campaign, or "another group" 23 working on behalf of Senator Burns' reelection, was responsible for the alleged call. 24 Complaint at 1. Senator Burns' authorized committee states categorically that it "did not 25 sponsor, finance, contribute to, or have knowledge of the alleged phone call complained

MUR 5860
Factual and Legal Analysis
Friends of Conrad Burns-2006 and
James Swain, in his official capacity as treasurer

- of." Response at 1. We have no information to the contrary. Therefore, the Commission
- 2 found no reason to believe that Friends of Conrad Burns-2006 and James Swain, in his
- 3 official capacity as treasurer, violated 2 U.S.C. §441d.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Additionally, the Commission has no information implicating the involvement of any other registered political committee, working either independently or on behalf of the Burns campaign, in the telephone call alleged in the complaint